

## TOPIC #1: INTERREGIONAL MODELING

### Initial I-80 study findings

- Existing regional travel models (MTC & SACOG) stop at the historic boundaries of each region while commuters, goods and the economy are increasingly interregional
- The SACOG land use model stops at regional boundaries; ABAG POLIS land use model has four external zones
- The Solano-Napa travel model is actually an interregional model incorporating 16 counties
- The statewide travel model has been used to forecast high speed rail ridership and is providing interregional forecasts as part of this study
- Currently there is minimal ability to forecast goods movement in existing travel models. The SACOG model forecasts truck trips within the region and to external stations at its boundaries.
- Different models provide very different travel forecasts
- There are different protocols on demographic forecasts for each region, particularly labor force models that tend to skew assumptions about the number of workers commuting between regions
- Very few existing travel models can accurately factor in variations in land use, particularly mixed use

### Initial I-80 study recommendations

- Add external “zones” to existing regional travel and land use models to pick up other regions – specifically add Solano County zones to the SACOG travel model and investigate advantages of adding external zones to MTC travel model
- Upgrade ABAG’s land use model to an integrated model that will be compatible with PECAS
- Add goods movement modeling capabilities to travel models when feasible
- Develop GIS parcel level data for Solano County that can be incorporated into SACOG models

Initial I-80 study recommendations (cont'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exchange demographic assumptions between regions at the start of each demographic forecast cycle (every two years)</li> <li>• Set up modeling protocol and process for updating and sharing data among SACOG, STA, ABAG, Caltrans and MTC</li> <li>• Prioritize upgrades to transportation models that can better incorporate travel impacts from land use changes</li> <li>• Add additional travel analysis zones to travel models to strengthen ability of models to pick up transportation impacts of land use changes</li> <li>• Develop better capacity to assist local jurisdictions in their understanding of how land use – both longer-term general plans and shorter-term development projects – will impact transportation and travel demand.</li> </ul>
Questions for Summit Breakout Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Are all different levels of travel models needed – statewide, regional and county level models? Should the state continue developing a statewide travel model to more accurately forecast interregional trips?</i></li> <li>• <i>How can transportation models better incorporate the impacts of land use decisions? Are county, regional or statewide models best suited for that?</i></li> <li>• <i>How can transportation models better incorporate forecasts for interregional goods movement, truck trips and passenger rail? Are county, regional or statewide models best suited for that?</i></li> </ul>
Other Outstanding Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could the regions provide the state socioeconomic data in a timely and ongoing manner in order to keep a statewide model up to date?</li> <li>• Is there a need for a national travel model to forecast goods movement through to western states, Chicago and east coast?</li> <li>• What are the lessons learned from Caltrans' efforts with the Intermodal Transportation Management System in the 1990s and specifically the freight demand module?</li> </ul>

## TOPIC #2: INTERREGIONAL PLANNING

### Initial I-80 study findings

- Up until two years ago, there was very minimal interregional planning and coordination between Sacramento region and the Bay Area
- While each region has pursued its own “smart growth” blueprint planning somewhat independently, the results appear to be complementary and may help dampen future transportation demand between the two regions
- Current policies for city-centered growth in Solano and Yolo counties have established a de facto “greenbelt” between the two regions and between many of the cities in the two counties
- The potential for greater “infill development” in Solano and Yolo counties may be stronger on the residential side than the employment side
- From an interregional perspective, Vacaville, Dixon and Davis really sit between the two regions rather than at the edge of each one – as such transportation investments in these locations should be analyzed from an interregional perspective

### Initial I-80 study recommendations

- Each region should explicitly consider each others household and employment projections at the start of each regional demographic projections forecast
- An ongoing technical committee and memorandum of understanding should be established among SACOG, MTC, ABAG, Solano Transportation Authority, Yolo County and Caltrans (could potentially involve other counties along I-80 corridor)
- The two regions should step up coordination on their blueprint planning efforts, at the very least to share success stories and learn from each other’s work

<p>Questions for Summit Breakout Groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>How can the Sacramento region and the Bay Area best coordinate their planning activities moving forward?</i></li> <li>• <i>Does it truly matter that northern California is becoming a megaregion? How should governmental entities respond without adding more layers of bureaucracy?</i></li> <li>• <i>Should the state do more to facilitate interregional planning -- particularly in evolving Megaregions?</i></li> </ul>
<p>Other Outstanding Questions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should Solano County strengthen its partnership with the Sacramento region and SACOG?</li> <li>• Should Sacramento and Placer counties – and other Bay Area counties along I-80 – be part of the recommended technical committee to share information across the corridor jurisdictions?</li> <li>• How can cities at the border of the two regions – notably Davis, Dixon, Vacaville, Winters, Woodland – better cooperate and coordinate around transportation and land use issues?</li> <li>• Are there lessons learned from MTC's Freeway Performance Initiative in Solano County that could be applied to the Sacramento region?</li> </ul>

### TOPIC #3: INTERREGIONAL TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENTS

#### Initial I-80 study findings

- I-80 and the central rail corridor are critical trade corridors with national and international significance
- The Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF) under Proposition 1B allowed for an unprecedented level of interregional cooperation among all the northern California planning agencies – the payoff may be in a significant share of funding from the TCIF account
- The Capitol Corridor will continue to grow in significance as a passenger rail corridor – it is already the third busiest Amtrak line in the nation.
- The Capitol Corridor – both for passengers and freight – needs significant investments and upgrades if it is to capture a larger market share of travelers between the two regions.
- MTC's Regional Rail Plan recommends significant upgrades to Capitol Corridor to achieve Oak-Sac travel time of 92 minutes including addition of third and fourth tracks from Oakland to Auburn

#### Initial I-80 study recommendations

- Each region should explicitly consider and coordinate with the other region's planned transportation investments at the start of each update to a regional transportation plan (RTP)
- Any expansion of freeway and HOV capacity between the two regions should be carefully linked to local land use strategies that minimize development at rural interchanges, and along corridors in order to preserve roadway capacity
- Expansion of Capitol Corridor, commuter rail service and express bus service between the two regions should be supported by local land use strategies that focus development around rail stations and bus transit hubs
- Over and above the Proposition 1B TCIF funding, financial resources need to be directed to both I-80 and Capitol Corridor in order to accommodate significant demand in the coming decades.

<p>Questions for Summit Breakout Groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Given that the Capitol Corridor is a truly interregional service, what more could be done to finance additional upgrades on the line including local commuter service?</i></li> <li>• <i>How can Caltrans' Districts 3 and 4 and the two regions coordinate more closely on I-80 investments?</i></li> <li>• <i>Are there opportunities for an interregional transportation financing measure that could fund critical highway and rail projects in the I-80 and Capitol Corridor?</i></li> </ul>
<p>Outstanding Questions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are HOV and possible HOT lanes on I-80 being planned and coordinated across the two regions?</li> <li>• How could the two regions work more closely together on the pending High Speed Rail bond?</li> </ul>